

REMARKS

I. Claims

With this Amendment, Applicants amend Claim 1, add new Claims 14-16 and cancel Claim 11. Therefore claims 1-10 and 12-16 are all the claims currently pending in the application.

A. Claims 1-13

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Rossmann, U.S. Patent No. 6,625,447 (“Rossmann”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1. Applicants submit that Rossmann fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations of the present invention as required by Claim 1, as amended. For example, Rossmann fails to disclose or suggest at least:

when display of unit data of the first unit transfer data is designated at the transmission destination, displaying the unit display data of the first unit transfer data and another display data, previously stored in the transmission destination. (Claim 1).

Rossmann is directed to a method and architecture for interactive two-way data communication. More specifically, Rossmann discloses a method through which, based on a request from “a two-way communication device,” a “set of linked pages” is selected based on the request and is transmitted to a two-way data communication device. According to the method, the user can then read a plurality of pages received in the data transfer, without newly

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. APPLICATION NO. 09/732,721
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. Q62202

transmitting another data transmission request to the server. (Rossmann, col. 4, ln. 40 to col. 5, ln. 25). According to the disclosure of Rossmann, then, the plurality of “pages” that are displayed to the user of the “two-way communication device” consist of data received from the client module in response to the user request. Rossmann fails to disclose or suggest displaying unit display data received from a transmission source along with data not received from the transmission source at that time (i.e. data that had been previously stored in the transmission destination).

For at least these exemplary reasons, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Rossmann, and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the §102(e) rejection of Claim 1.

Claims 2-10. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-10 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependence on Claim 1, and for the additional reasons presented herein.

With respect to Claim 2, Applicants submit that Rossmann fails to disclose or suggest at least: “displaying the unit display data of the first unit transfer data and the special unit display data as another display data in a predetermined order.” (Claim 2). Rossmann discloses that the data received from the client module, in the form of “cards” can be displayed by the user in any order selected by the user. Rossmann fails to disclose or suggest displaying the data in a predetermined order, as required by Claim 2.

With respect to Claims 4 and 8, Applicants respectfully submit that Rossmann fails to disclose or suggest at least: “automatically switching to display unit display data of the first unit

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. APPLICATION NO. 09/732,721
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. Q62202

transfer data after the special unit display data is displayed for a predetermined period of time.”

Rossmann fails to disclose displaying any second data after any first data has been displayed for a predetermined period of time. According to Rossmann, the display is changed/switched based on a user pressing a predetermined key (*see* Rossmann, col. 12, lns. 45-50). Therefore, no “predetermined period of time” passes between a first display and a second display.

With respect to Claim 6, Applicants respectfully submit that Rossmann fails to disclose or suggest at least: “transferring second unit transfer data from a second transmission source to the transmission destination when display of unit display data of the first unit transfer data is designated.” Rossmann fails to disclose or suggest transferring second data from a second source in response to a designation that first data from a first source be displayed. Rossmann describes only displaying that data which the user selects to be displayed (*see* Rossmann, col. 13, lns. 9-18). Applicants further submit that Claims 7-9 are further patentable by virtue of their dependence on Claim 6.

For the above exemplary reasons Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the §102(e) rejection of Claims 2-10.

Claim 12. With respect to Claim 12, Applicants respectfully submit that Rossmann fails to disclose or suggest at least the requirement in Claim 12 of: “displaying the unit display data after the special unit display data is displayed.” As discussed above with respect to Claim 2, Rossmann discloses a method whereby the user of a two-way communication device can display

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. APPLICATION NO. 09/732,721
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. Q62202

the data received from a client module in any order, and fails to disclose or suggest displaying special unit display data before displaying unit display data.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the §102(e) rejection of Claim 12.

Claim 13. With respect to Claim 13, Applicants respectfully submit that Rossmann fails to disclose or suggest at least: “when display of unit display data of the first unit transfer data is designated, transferring second unit transfer data containing a plurality of unit display data from a second transmission source to the information communication terminal.” This limitation recited in Claim 13 parallels the limitation discussed above with respect to Claim 6. Applicants respectfully submit that the above argument with respect to Claim 6 also applies to Claim 13.

For the above exemplary reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the §102(e) rejection of Claim 13.

B. New Claims 14-16

Applicants have added new claims 14-16 in order more fully to cover various aspects of Applicants' invention as disclosed in the specification.

II. Conclusion

For at least the exemplary reasons presented above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. APPLICATION NO. 09/732,721
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. Q62202

interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Respectfully submitted,


Howard L. Bernstein
Registration No. 25,665

Date: February 6, 2004